



Universidades Lusíada

Oliveira, Maria Isabel Fernandes Torres Franchini
Gaspar, Tânia, 1977-

Rodrigues, Paula Cristina Lopes, 1970-

Work and active aging : is there a relationship between health and meaning in life?

<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-12-2020-0208>

<http://hdl.handle.net/11067/6185>

Metadados

Data de Publicação	2022
Resumo	This study aims to explain the health impact of work demands and organization, job content, leadership and values in the workplace. It also explores the extent to which health conditions influence meaning in life in late career. The sample consisted of 1330 Portuguese-based individuals aged 55-75 years. The structural equation modelling was used for the data analysis and to test the research questions. The results showed that stress and burnout are affected influenced by work demands and organ...
Editor	Emerald
Palavras Chave	Stresse ocupacional - Portugal, Envelhecimento - Aspectos psicológicos, Qualidade de vida
Tipo	article
Revisão de Pares	Não
Coleções	[ILID-CLISSIS] Artigos

Esta página foi gerada automaticamente em 2024-11-14T18:01:31Z com
informação proveniente do Repositório



Work and Active Aging: is there a relationship between Health and Meaning in Life?

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Workplace Health Management</i>
Manuscript ID	IJWHM-12-2020-0208.R4
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Working conditions, Active aging, Stress, Burnout, Meaning in life

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Table I – Measurement scales, reliability and dimensionality statistics

Variable	Items ^a	Factor Loading	Mean	SD	CR (AVE)	Cronbach Alpha
Values at Work (VW) and Leadership (L) (VW_L)	VW1: Is your work recognized and appreciated by the management?	0.718***	2.40	1.061	0.952 (0.712)	0.912
	VW2: Are you treated fairly at your workplace?	0.781***	2.33	1.090		
	VW3: Can the employees trust the information that comes from the management?	0.683***	2.07	1.014		
	VW4: Does the management trust the employees to do their work well?	0.741***	2.07	0.998		
	VW5: Are conflicts resolved in a fair way?	0.828***	2.52	1.026		
	VW6: Is the work distributed fairly?	0.811***	2.57	1.051		
	L1: If you should need it, how often would your immediate superior be willing to listen to your problems at work?	0.783***	2.50	1.235		
	L2: If you should need it, how often would you get help and support from your immediate superior?	0.762***	2.66	1.229		
Work Organization (WO) and Job Contents (JC) (WO_JC)	WO1: Do you have a large degree of influence on the decisions concerning your work?	0.743***	2.47	1.252	0.896 (0.684)	0.904
	WO2: Can you influence the amount of work assigned to you?	0.747***	2.74	1.243		
	JC1: Do you have the possibility of learning new things through your work?	0.736***	2.21	1.128		
	JC2: Does your work require you to take the initiative?	0.752***	2.00	1.069		
Quantitative Demands (QD)	QD1: Do you get behind with your work?	0.806***	3.94	0.969	0.852 (0.742)	0.880
	QD2: Do you have enough time for your work tasks?	0.765***	2.36	1.136		
Work Pace (WP)	WP1: Do you have to work very fast?	0.901***	2.66	1.111	0.947 (0.899)	0.901
	WP2: Do you work at a high pace throughout the day?	0.914***	2.76	1.133		
Stress (S) and Burnout (B) (S_B)	B1: How often have you felt worn out?	0.873***	3.11	0.887	0.956 (0.845)	0.887
	B2: How often have you been physically exhausted?	0.897***	3.25	0.929		
	S1: How often have you been stressed?	0.882***	3.19	0.978		
	S2: How often have you been irritable?	0.803***	3.32	0.900		
Meaning in Life (ML)	ML1: I am usually bored	0.743***	5.17	1.594	0.924 (0.753)	0.803
	ML4: My personal existence is utterly meaningless without purpose	0.816***	5.77	1.514		
	ML6: If I could choose, I would prefer never to have been born	0.785***	6.29	1.502		
		0.831***	6.11	1.525		

	ML9: My life is empty, filled only with despair					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

***p-value < 0.001; a – items with factor loading < 0.5 was eliminated; standard deviation (SD); composite reliability (CR); average variance extracted (AVE).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table II –Discriminant Validity

Variables	AVE	QD	WP	WO_JC	VW_L	S_B	ML
Quantitative Demands (QD)	0.742	0.861					
Work Pace (WP)	0.899	0.154	0.948				
Work Organization and Job Contents (WO_JC)	0.684	-0.221	0.395	0.827			
Values at Work and Leadership (VW_L)	0.712	-0.305	-0.072	0.278	0.843		
Stress and Burnout (S_B)	0.845	0.342	0.245	-0.131	-0.237	0.919	
Meaning in Life (ML)	0.753	0.220	-0.015	-0.257	-0.261	0.468	0.867

Note: Numbers in diagonal represent square root of average variance extracted; values above the diagonal represents the correlation of constructs and all are significant at the 0.01 level (bilateral)

Table III – Path Estimate and Conclusions

Path Hypotheses	B	SE	t	Conclusion
H1: Quantitative Demands → Stress and Burnout	0.173 [0.029;0.317]	0.072	7.342***	Accept
H2: Work Pace → Stress and Burnout	0.356 [0.3;0.412]	0.028	5.570***	Accept
H3: Work Organization and Job Contents → Stress and Burnout	-0.130 [-0.21;-0.05]	0.040	-4.048***	Accept
H4: Values at Work and Leadership → Stress and Burnout	-0.152 [-0.222;-0.082]	0.035	-5.025***	Accept
H5: Stress and Burnout → Meaning in Life	0.648 [0.552;0.744]	0.048	12.993***	Accept

Work and Active Aging: is there a relationship between Health and Meaning in Life?

Abstract

Purpose - This study aims to explain the health impact of work demands and organization, job content, leadership and values in the workplace. It also explores the extent to which health conditions influence meaning in life in late career.

Design/methodology/approach - The sample consisted of 1330 Portuguese-based individuals aged 55-75 years. The structural equation modelling was used for the data analysis and to test research questions.

Findings - The results showed that stress and burnout are influenced by work demands and organization, job content, leadership and values in the workplace. Health status affects meaning in life.

Research limitations/implications – Although participants were asked to answer the questionnaire bearing in mind their last work experience, retirees could have had difficulty reporting on their last work, therefore, in future research, the use of a qualitative methodology could also be equated, as to complement richer information regarding past experiences in the work context.

Practical and social implications -

Considering the main goals of the United Nations 2030 Agenda for sustainable development, this study contributes, namely, to the 3rd one – Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages. In fact, directing a look at the condition in which older people work and at their health, contributes not only to more productive organizations, to less spending of public money on health, but also to a more inclusive society. Bearing in mind workers are progressively retiring later and that the exposure to certain work conditions during the late career is problematic for organisations and for society in general, this study has practical and social implication.

Originality - Considering demographic changes and the aging of the active population in Portugal and the scarce studies carried out in the country concerning this relevant theme, we believe that the conclusions may constitute an important input for workplace policies regarding older workers. In addition, little research has focused on the effect of health in meaning in life.

Keywords - Working conditions, Active aging, Stress, Burnout, Meaning in life.

Paper type – Empirical research paper.

Acknowledgement - This work is financed from national funds by FCT - Foundation for Science and Technology, under Project UIDB/04624/2020.



Introduction

Organizational psychology research in the past four decades has focused on the relationship between work and health (Pisanti, Montgomery and Quick, 2017), among other. For its part, the European Union has been displaying growing concern about health at work. Studies into the actively working population have now become more regular, and have led to publications, with multiple indicators, such as the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) reports. Although the results may contain some bias based on the multidimensional character of health indicators in the workplace (Lasfargues, 2005), due to the fact that the respondents will possibly be among the healthiest in the population (which is why they are not absent from the workplace) and also because the answers may reflect the social desirability phenomenon, the EWCS' continue to report increased exposure to health risks, such as high work intensity and emotional demands (Eurofound, 2019). At the same time, there are large asymmetries regarding factors such as gender, age, the nature of the work activity, the work sector and the countries concerned. These can be explained, on the one hand, by prevailing notions of division of labour, for example, based on stereotypical views of older workers or women's capabilities (Volkoff, 1997) and, on the other hand, the employment and social protection policies in each country. Indeed women, who are globally more involved in the education and health sectors, are particularly exposed to psychosocial risks, that is, high emotional demands, which are associated with poorer health indicators (Eurofound, 2019). Similar discrepancies are evident based on generational cohort. For example, a study carried out in Portugal in the banking context (Torres, 2006) showed that managers loaded younger people more heavily than older generations with commercial responsibilities, high workload and longer working hours, which, together with low autonomy, systematic exposure to change, monotony and feelings of job insecurity, led to higher stress levels. A comparative study of nurses in Portugal and Spain (Baldonado *et al.*, 2018) also showed that, in the Spanish sample, age was negatively correlated with stress. In the context of health professionals, Marôco, Marôco, Leite, Bastos, Vazão and Campos (2016) observed higher levels of burnout in younger doctors and nurses. Corroborating these results, Souza, Helal and Paiva (2017) concluded that young workers are more at risk of burnout. In a further examination of burnout, significant differences were recognized by Hakanen and Bakker (2016) in various socio-demographic variables, such as gender, age and socioeconomic status.

Despite these differences, exposure to psychosocial risks is transversal across different socio-professional categories, with work intensity, high competition and weak confidence in work groups being the main factors that cause malaise in the workplace (Thébaud-Mony, Davezies, Voguel and

1
2
3 Volkoff, 2015). This issue deserves particular attention, given that the effects of stress on health and
4 quality of life are unquestionable, triggering, among other, premature aging (Sadir and Lipp, 2009).

5
6 At a time when average life expectancy is increasing and some workers increasingly find it imperative
7 to work until later in life, it is important to guarantee quality of life and recognize the factors that
8 contribute to active aging. According to the WHO (2002) “active aging is the process of optimizing
9 opportunities for health, participation and security in order to enhance quality of life as people age”.
10 Underlying this definition is the concept that an active person is someone who maintains autonomy and
11 independence and is involved in various work-related activities.
12
13
14
15

16 Studies have demonstrated a link between meaning in life and perceived levels of stress. In the study
17 developed by Park and Baumeister (2017) it was found that people who had lower levels of meaning of
18 life or where this meaning had been threatened, display greater stress than those who reported having a
19 greater one. On the other hand, the anticipation of future stress causes people to search for meaning in
20 life, which can be seen as a protective factor against stress. Although some authors have suggested that
21 some negative life experiences may serve as opportunities to reinforce the meaning in life (Vohs, Aaker
22 and Catapano, 2019; Russo-Netzer, Sinai and Zeevi, 2019), in general it is recognized that favourable
23 experiences provide this reinforcement. One of the important areas when analyzing this relationship is
24 work.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Despite the considerable number of studies that have assessed the impact of the meaning of life on
32 health, we are unaware of any that assess the opposite. Thus, we believe that this study, whose goal is
33 to assess the extent to which health is a factor that promotes meaning in life, could make a significant
34 contribution to the literature.
35
36

37 Research should take into account the goals presented in the United Nations 2030 Agenda for sustainable
38 development (United Nations, 2015), the following are especially relevant to the present manuscript,
39 the goal 3 “Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages” and the goal 8 “Promote
40 sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work
41 for all” (United Nations, 2015, pp14).
42
43
44
45

46 In the present study we aim to understand the health impact, namely, stress and burnout, of (1) demands
47 at work (quantitative demands and work pace); (2) work organization and job content (influence at work
48 and possibilities for development) and (3) leadership and values in the workplace (social support from
49 supervisors, recognition, trust in management, and justice) (Pejtersen, Kristensen, Borg and Bjorner,
50 2010).
51
52
53

54 The present study is divided into six parts. The first three focus on the main conceptual constructs
55 underlying the study, relating work, psychosocial risks, health, active aging and meaning in life, and
56 which lead us to formulate five hypotheses and well as the model design. The fourth part describes the
57 methodology, the participants, the measurement instruments and the procedure. The fifth presents the
58
59
60

1
2
3 results of the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses together with an estimation of the structural
4 equation model. Finally, we present the discussion, outline the limitations of the study and make
5 suggestions for future research.
6
7
8
9

10 **Work, Psychosocial Risks and Health**

11
12 Due to the growing, multiple and complex challenges that employees face in the workplace, new issues
13 have arisen in terms of work organization and management; this is reflected in the emergence of
14 psychosocial risks that can affect workers' health and safety. Some of these conditions are related to
15 high quantitative and emotional work demands, intense work rhythms, low decision latitude, poor
16 relationships with peers and managers, and job insecurity, among other issues. Many studies have shown
17 the effects of exposure to harmful working conditions on health, such as stress and burnout, in different
18 sectors and professions.
19
20
21
22
23

24 Lazarus and Folkman (1984, p.21) defined stress as “the relationship between the person and the
25 environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering
26 his or her well-being”.
27
28
29

30 Maslach and Jackson (1981) defined burnout as “exhaustion syndrome”; this syndrome leads individuals
31 to experience physical and emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and cynicism, a lack of personal
32 fulfilment, devaluation and personal ineffectiveness. Hakanen and Bakker (2016, p. 1) described
33 burnout as “a response to prolonged stressors at work, and is defined as a chronic syndrome including
34 exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy”.
35
36
37

38 Despite the recognized differences between these constructs, some authors, such as Ferreira (2015),
39 argued that the results of burnout assessments are closely related to the results of stress assessments. In
40 fact, an increase in stress is often accompanied by depressive symptoms, such as sadness, low self-
41 confidence and self-esteem, lack of interest in daily activities, among others, and which, if experienced
42 for a long period of time, may lead to emotional exhaustion. In particular, prolonged exposure to
43 excessive workload has been recognized as a cause of emotional exhaustion, mainly because it places
44 workers in a position that prevents them from meeting professional challenges (Maslach and Leiter,
45 2008). According to Spector and Jex (1998, cited in Casper, Sonnetag and Tremmel, 2017, p. 798), high
46 workload “refers to having a great amount of work to do in too little time”.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 A study carried out with nurses in Ghana, by Kokoroko and Sanda (2019), identified the effect of high
54 levels of workload on stress. In the context of knowledge workers, Albertsen, Rugulies, Garde and Burr
55 (2010) also found that quantitative demands were positively associated with stress symptoms,
56 particularly in cognitive stress.
57
58
59
60

Other studies, with very different samples, establish the connection between work pace and health, namely that of negative stress. Macky and Boxall (2008) conclude that work intensity and a high-performance work system cause more stress. When referring to a research conducted with ICT workers, Evenstad (2018), highlights the consequences of acceleration as constant time pressure and work intensification in stress and burnout, as well as in the promotion of work-family conflicts.

An interesting research conducted among musicians into the Danish symphony orchestras, reveal that adverse psychosocial work environment, i.e. work pace, was strongly and positively associated with stress symptoms (Holst, Paarup and Baelum, 2011). A relation between work pace, stress, and cumulative trauma disorders was found by Arndt (1987).

Finally, a study carried out with German babyboomers (Tophoven, Tisch, Rauch and Burghardt, 2015), also came to the conclusion that increasing work pace is negatively related to mental health.

Based on the above, we formulate the following hypotheses:

H1: Participants exposed to prolonged high quantitative work demands report high levels of stress and burnout.

H2: Participants exposed to prolonged high work pace report high levels of stress and burnout.

According to the JD-C (job-demand control) model (Karasek, 1979; Karasek and Theorell, 1990), stress and burnout are caused not only by high demands at work, such as quantitative demands and work pace, but also by low decision latitude, which is associated with low control in the workplace. The JD-R (job-demand resources) model (Bakker, Demerouti and Euwema, 2005; Bakker and Demerouti, 2016; Taris and Schaufeli, 2016), in addressing various types of jobs, with different demands, requirements and constraints, proposed that job resources, be they physical, psychological, social or organizational, may buffer the impact of job demands, and thus reduce stress and burnout effects. Bakker, Demerouti and Euwema (2005) argued that autonomy in the workplace is a decisive factor, in that it enables workers to decide when and how to deal with job demands.

Some studies have emphasized the role that meaningful work has as a predictor of mental health outcomes, such as stress, inasmuch that work can promote personal growth (Allan, Dexter, Kinsey and Parker, 2016). The opportunity to develop knowledge and skills through one's working life seems to be determinant for health and well-being.

Based on the above, we formulate the following hypothesis:

H3: Participants who report having more influence over their work, as well as opportunities to learn and develop, report lower levels of stress and burnout.

There is extensive literature on the role that leadership, that is, the perception that one is supported by one's supervisor, recognition, confidence in management and feelings of justice, play in health. Bakker,

Demerouti and Euwema, (2005) demonstrated that the quality of the relationships that workers have with their supervisors, measured through, for example, communication and feedback processes, has a buffering effect on the impact of workload on health. In a study conducted on a sample of university professors, García, Inglesias, Saleta and Romay (2016) identified the lack of leadership qualities on supervisors as one of the most decisive factors affecting health. Kokoroko and Sanda (2019) concluded that support from supervisors contributes to more effective workload management and lower stress levels.

Siqueira and Pavadom (2008) defined well-being at work as a psychological dimension to some extent associated with the quality of social relations established with supervisors in the work environment. Yang et al. (2015) also suggested that support from supervisors had a direct effect on work-related stress, which is one of the main psychosocial risk factors in some professional contexts (García, Inglesias, Saleta and Romay, 2016).

Organizational support and empowerment were also recognized by Román-Calderón, Krikorian, Ruiz and Gaviria (2016) as important in helping employees perceive greater meaning in their work and feelings of greater competence. As we will try to demonstrate, when employees' feel there is meaning in their work, this has a positive effect on their health.

The concept of "... organizational justice as meaning the employees' perception of impartiality and equality in their workplace" (Greenberg, 1990; Topa and Morales, 2006, cited in García-Guiu, Molero and Moriano, 2015, p.62), has been studied for its role, not only in group cohesion and organizational identification, but also as a mediating variable. Some studies (Jensen and Luthans, 2006; Kiersch, 2012) have concluded that leadership, particularly authentic leadership, that promotes a positive organizational climate, anchored in relationships of trust and respect for fundamental ethical principles, such as justice, plays a decisive role in the well-being of employees.

Leadership has also been studied with regard to engagement. Although they are not considered opposites, engagement and burnout seem to correlate negatively (Shauffelli and Bakker, 2004). Some studies have demonstrated how leadership influences the meaning credited to work (Ward and King, 2017). In a sample of diverse professionals, Sadir and Lipp (2009) identified not only overwork, but also difficulty in dealing with their hierarchical superior and lack of recognition among the main sources of work related stress.

Gonçalves, Vilela, Terra and Nogueira (2016), based on the work psychodynamics approach of Christophe Dejours, identified recognition in the workplace as one of the main causes of feelings of any pleasure that employees might experience at work, and as being associated with good mental health.

In view of the above, we present the following hypothesis:

H4: Participants who feel recognized at work, who perceive they are supported by their supervisor, who trust their management and experience a fair organizational environment, report lower levels of stress and burnout.

Work, Health and Meaning in Life

The concept of meaning in life was introduced by Frankl (2004) in the 1940s. In essence, it is the way in which a person positions themselves in relation to their past and how they project themselves in the future, through a dynamic and personal assessment of the degree of coherence experienced in the present moment. For Frankl (2004) this assessment is continuous and may lead one to experience an “existential void”, which can cause mental health problems.

Various definitions of the meaning in life construct have emerged over time. Nonetheless, some authors, such as Ward and King (2017), have recognized the existence of three common components: (1) Purpose in life, that is, the possibility of pursuing goals; (2) Significance, that is, the perception that one, and one’s role, are valued by others; and (3) Coherence in relation to one’s surroundings, that is, the achievement of harmony between oneself and the world. These three components are decisive in the work context since, as Davezies (1998) highlights, it is through work that humans structure their own existence, discover themselves, and test their limits. Thus, the recognition of purpose, coherence and significance at work create the impression in the employee that their work is meaningful (Ward and King, 2017). However, the specific impact that work has on meaning in life does not yet seem to be fully understood (Ward and King, 2017), despite the increase in studies that have sought to explain their relationship. Work is central to human existence and it has been argued that it has a great influence on the meaning in life, insofar as carrying out a meaningful activity creates coherence and personal appreciation which, on the one hand, can promote satisfaction and engagement and, on the other, can lead to lower stress levels. For example, Fairlie (2011), Lips-Wiersma and Wright (2012) and Steger, et al. (2012) (cited in War and King, 2017), showed that there was an inverse relationship between meaningful work and some negative well-being outcomes, such as burnout.

In the health sector, Gregersen, Vicente-Höper and Nienhaus (2016) showed that access to resources, including the possibility of being involved in meaningful work, and experiencing positive leader-employee relationships, are associated with lower levels of emotional exhaustion.

It is a fact that the literature profusely explores the protective effect of the meaning of life in the management of stress and burnout, in multiple professions, namely those that are more exposed to psychosocial risks. Even though the relationships between the meaning of life of older individuals, health indicators and satisfaction with life (Shiah, Chang, Chiang, Lin and Tam, 2015) are known, we wonder if these indicators could also interfere with the way the subject pursues goals, how they value their role and the way they perceive that they are valued by others, as well as the harmony they find

1
2
3 between themselves and the world (Ward and King, 2017). As Brühlmann (2013, p.521) highlights,
4 “Burnout is also a meaning of life crisis, triggered by the narrowing of performance and success”.
5

6
7 In a study conducted by Ben-Itzak et al (2015) the conclusion that meaning of life is a predictor of
8 burnout was recorded. Authors developed a regression analysis that showed two significant factors
9 associated with burnout: worry and a sense of existential meaning. Many professionals experiencing
10 burnout revealed high emotional exhaustion, high depersonalization, and a low sense of personal
11 accomplishment.
12
13

14
15 Thus, to test the relationship between stress and burnout and meaning in life, we make the following
16 hypothesis:
17

18
19 H5: Participants who show lower levels of stress and burnout report more meaning in life.
20
21
22

23 **Method**

24 *Participants*

25
26 This study was carried out among 1330 Portuguese participants, from various parts of the country,
27 including north, center, south and islands. The participants ranged between 55 and 75 years old, with
28 the average age roughly being 60 years old. As to gender, 62% were female and 38% male.
29
30

31
32 The inclusion criteria were active or retired participants with or without a professional activity. Of the
33 respondents, 47% were active, 46 % retired, and 7% retired but with an occupation. The professional
34 activities were linked to education, health, public and domestic services.
35
36

37
38 The inclusion of retirees in the sample is based on the idea that the exposure to certain conditions during
39 their “active working life” could have an impact on health later on. This can be explained by the concept
40 that of work “delayed effects” may have on people’s health. As several authors argue (Gollac & Volkoff,
41 2000; Volkoff 2005; Davezies, 2001), prolonged exposure to certain risks, such as those of a
42 psychosocial nature, is not always accompanied by immediate effects but, conversely, these are
43 experienced later. This means that, although, for example, a worker has been exposed in the last stage
44 of his career to adverse working conditions (such as a high workload, high emotional demands, ...), he
45 may suffer from health problems during retirement, such as anxiety or sleep disorders. In fact,
46 longitudinal studies reveal the long-term effects of exposure to work-related stress and other
47 psychosocial risks of work (Havermans, et al, 2018). Physical, psychological, and social health impacts,
48 notably work-related stress and psychosocial risks at work are associated with heart disease, depression,
49 and musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) and there is consistent evidence that high job demands, poor
50 control, and an imbalance between effort and return are risk factors for mental and physical health
51 problems.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, several studies (e.g. Cheng, Chen, Chen, Burr & Hasselhorn, 2013) show that effects of age on
4 the associations between psychosocial conditions and health are moderate.

5
6 Considering these arguments and the fact that retirees were asked to fill in the survey bearing in mind
7 their last professional experience, the authors find the sample appropriate.
8
9

10 11 12 *Measurement instruments*

13
14 The questionnaire included the following components: 1. Sociodemographic questions 2. Psychosocial
15 factors at work 3. Meaning in life.

16
17
18 1. Sociodemographic questions: age, gender, employment status.

19
20
21 2. Psychosocial Factors at Work (COPSOQ II)

22
23 The present study used the Portuguese short version of the COPSOQ II (Silva *et al.*, 2011) – Copenhagen
24 Psychosocial Questionnaire. The COPSOQ was developed and validated by Kristensen, Hannerz, Hogh,
25 and Vilhelm (2005) in collaboration with the Danish National Institute of Occupational Health
26 (Copenhagen) and its main objective is to evaluate psychosocial factors at work. It consists of 40 items
27 assessed on 5-point Likert-type scale: 1 - Never / hardly ever; 2 - Rarely; 3 - Sometimes; 4 - Often; 5 -
28 Always; or 1 - Nothing / almost nothing; 2. A little; 3 - Moderately; 4 - Very; 5 - Extremely.

29
30
31
32 The COPSOQ II choice was mostly due to the fact that this is a widely used instrument, with its shorter
33 version being the most attractive from the participants standpoint (Kristensen et al., 2005). Likewise, as
34 the COPSOQ is an instrument developed by several independent scales, and based on guidance from
35 the ethics committee, the scale regarding violence at work was removed. These items are normally
36 placed at the end of the instrument and therefore do not influence the normal filling out of the instrument.

37
38
39
40
41 The final version of the questionnaire used in this study included 36 items measuring the following
42 dimensions: 1. Demands at work (quantitative demands, work pace, emotional demands), 2. Work
43 organization and job content (influence, development opportunities, meaning of work, commitment to
44 the workplace) 3. Interpersonal relations and leadership (predictability, recognition, role clarity, quality
45 of leadership, social support from supervisor) 4. Work-individual interfaces (job satisfaction, work-
46 family conflict) 5. Values at workplace level (trust regarding management, justice) 6. Health and well-
47 being (general health perceptions, burnout, stress) (Pejtersen, Kristensen, Borg, and Bjorner, 2010). As
48 the authors themselves point out, the COPSOQ is not just a mere questionnaire, it is, among other things,
49 an instrument for improving working conditions. In fact, it is a tool that aims to assess the conditions to
50 which workers are exposed in real work contexts, with a view to designing remedial interventions
51 (Bjorner, Albertsen, and Rugulies, 2010).

52
53
54
55 3. Meaning in Life (PIL-Test) (Crubaugh and Maholich, 1964; Harlow, Newcomb and Bentler, 1987;
56 Peralta, 2001; Peralta and Silva, 2003). The PIL-Test aims to assess the degree of existential emptiness,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and one's level of self-realization and appreciation of the meaning in life, based on Frankl's (2004)
4 formulation of the construct. "The original scale of "Purpose in Life Test" (PIL) with 20 items have two
5 dimensions (the affective component – experience dimension, and the cognitive component – existential
6 dimension). We used 4 items to measure the "Meaning in life" and focused on the items that translate a
7 normative and non-pathological perspective, two items considering the experience dimension and the
8 other two considering the existential dimension."

9
10
11
12
13 Translated and adapted for the Portuguese population, that is, for older adults (Peralta, 2001; Peralta
14 and Silva, 2003), this instrument consists of 20 items, assessed on 7-point Likert-type scales measuring
15 three dimensions or factors: 1. Meaning 2. Will to live 3. Happiness. Considering that meaning, is the
16 most robust dimension of this instrument, focused on a normative, non-pathological perspective, the
17 authors' chose only to privilege this one.
18
19
20
21
22

23 *Procedure*

24
25
26 Several organizations located in different areas of Portugal were contacted to help with the data
27 collection. These included, among other entities, senior universities, unions, businesses, municipalities,
28 day-care centres, and NGOs working with people in the age range of the study. In all, 19 institutions
29 participated in the data collection. The questionnaire was, in parallel, made available online. Although
30 1352 answers were obtained, only 1330 were fully completed, 62% returned paper and pencil versions,
31 and 38% electronic versions.
32
33
34

35
36 The questionnaire, self-administered, anonymous and confidential, was approved by the ethics
37 committee of the ARSLVT/Health Ministry pro.023/CES/INV/2014.
38

39
40 Finally, as the instrument incorporates work-related issues, retired respondents were asked to report on
41 their last work experiences.
42
43
44

45 **Results**

46 *Confirmatory Factor Analysis*

47
48
49 A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to validate the measurement model. The
50 measurement model provided goodness of fit with $X^2 = 810.002$, $df = 238$, $X^2/df = 3.4033$, comparative
51 fit index (CFI) = 0.985, Tucker Lewis index (TLI) = 0.954, incremental fit index (IFI) = 0.986 and root
52 mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.071 (Hair et al. 2006).
53
54
55

56
57 To assess multicollinearity of data, several regression models on the constructs to calculate the VIF
58 (Variance Inflation Factor) were carried out. The VIF values ranged from 1.24 to 2.03, which are
59 considered unproblematic (Kleinbaum *et al.*, 1988). Items with factor loadings below 0.5 were
60

eliminated (Hair et al., 2006). All items were significantly linked to their corresponding latent factor with standardized regression weights ranging from 0.683 to 0.914. The items with factor loading above 0.5 are eliminated from the measurement model according to the recommendations from Hair et al. (2006) and Bagozzi and Yi (1988). All items of emotional demands has factor loading above 0.5 showing that this dimension was not important for the object of the study. Tests of reliability and convergent and discriminant validity were also undertaken. Reliability was assessed through Cronbach's *alpha* (α) (Hair et al., 2006), convergent validity through composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE) (Hair et al., 2006), besides discriminant validity was achieved as all the pair-wise inter-construct correlations were lower than the square root of the AVEs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). A summary of the results related to reliability, and convergent and discriminant validity can be seen in Tables I and II.

“A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) were performed to assess the measurement model. The items with factor loading < 0.50 were eliminated. Then, with respect to the “Demands at work” dimension, the items about the emotional demands are deleted. In the “Interpersonal relations and leadership”, we only consider the items regarding the leadership. We do not include the “work-individual interface” dimension in our study. And, finally, in the “Health and well-being” dimension, we only consider the items about the stress and the burnout.”

(Insert Tables I and II)

Structural Equation Model

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) with AMOS 21.0 was used to test the hypotheses proposed in the conceptual model. The results provided good fit indices with $X^2 = 898.269$, $df = 247$, $X^2(247) = 3.6367$, $p < 0.001$, $X^2/df = 3.6367$, CFI = 0.955, TLI = 0.924, IFI = 0.956 and RMSEA = 0.077. The conceptual model explains the 21.2% variance of the meaning of life (ML) and the 16.4% variance of stress and burnout (S_B). The results of the hypotheses tested are in Table III.

(Insert Table III).

The data supported all the hypotheses. Quantitative demands (QD) positively influenced stress and burnout (S_B) ($\beta = 0.173$, $p < 0.001$), as expected, supporting H1. Work pace (WP) positively influenced stress and burnout (S_B) ($\beta = 0.356$, $p < 0.001$), as expected, supporting H2. Work organization and job content (WO_JC) negatively affected stress and burnout (S_B) ($\beta = -0.130$, $p < 0.001$), as expected, supporting H3. A similar result was obtained between values at work and leadership (VW_L) and stress and burnout (S_B). Values at work (VW_L) and Leadership negatively affected stress along with burnout (S_B) ($\beta = -0.152$, $p < 0.001$), as expected, supporting H4. Finally, the data also supported H5 because stress and burnout felt by individuals increased feelings of dissatisfaction

with life; that is, stress and burnout (S_B) positively affect meaning in life (ML) ($\beta = 0.648, p < 0.001$), as expected, supporting H5.

A post-hoc analysis was done to analyze if the model shows different results without the retired respondents. For that the pool data was divided into separate covariance matrices of total ($n = 1330$) and active workers ($n = 684$). The base model was defined as the unconstrained model, where all the paths are free to vary across both groups. First the factorial invariance of the models was confirmed ($\Delta\chi^2(df) = 33.924 < \Delta\chi^2_{0.95}(22) = 38.124$) when comparing the unconstrained model with the measurement weights assuming that the unconstrained to be correct. Assuming the model unconstrained to be correct and comparing with the model with structural variances fixed ($\Delta\chi^2(df) = 104.791 < \Delta\chi^2_{0.95}(84) = 111.852$) it is also verified that the adjustment qualities of the unconstrained model with the fixed structural covariance do not differ significantly, showing the invariance of the factorial model for the two groups (total vs. Active workers). The chi-square difference test provides no significant results, and the path coefficients were not significantly different across groups ($\Delta\chi^2(1) = 3.21, p < 0.001$). Indeed, the path coefficients regarding the relationship between the independent variables (quantitative demands, work organization and job content, values at work and leadership and work pace) and stress and burnout does not show statistically significant differences and the same occurs between stress and burnout and meaning of life.

Discussion

This study aimed to explain the impact of quantitative demands and work pace, organization and job content (its influence at work and development), as well as leadership and values in the workplace (social support from supervisors, recognition, trust in management and justice) have on health (stress and burnout). We also explore in to what extent health conditions influence the meaning in life in the last period of the worker's career. It is clear that exposure to harmful working conditions puts the health of workers at risk and, as Yamada, Matsudaira, Irmano, Kitamura and Iso (2016) showed, that psychosocial factors also have a clear influence on the quality of life. In corroboration of the multiple studies presented (García, Inglesias, Saleta and Romay, 2016; Malasch and Leiter, 2008; Kokoroko and Sanda, 2019), when exposed to psychosocial risks, such as high quantitative demands and high work pace, participants showed higher levels of stress and burnout. In fact, research in the context of work and organizations has shown that the quality of the work environment, to which workload, autonomy and active participation of workers contribute, and the nature of relationships and leadership in the workplace, are paramount for well-being (Zábrowská *et al.*, 2014). As Hiesinger and Tophoven (2019) point out, high psychosocial workload negatively affects physical and particularly mental health among older workers.

1
2
3 Inversely, work environments that encourage participation and provide experiences that enhance
4 development are associated with lower levels of stress and burnout. When workers believe that their
5 work and effort are recognized that they are supported by management, they have confidence in the
6 organization's management, and that they work in an environment where justice prevails, their levels of
7 stress and burnout are positively affected. Sousa, Cabral and Batista (2019) also concluded that physical
8 and mental exhaustion are clearly related to work overload and lack of recognition.
9
10

11
12
13 Although some studies show the mediating role that individual characteristic can have in the way
14 stressful work situations are handled, for example, by one's ability to trigger emotion regulation
15 strategies (Hirschle, Godim, Alberton and Ferreira, 2019), that is, due to stress mindset (Casper,
16 Sonnetag and Tremmel, 2017) or personality characteristics (Vaz Serra, 2000), the effects of
17 psychosocial risks on workers' health are indisputable.
18
19
20

21
22 The literature also corroborates the link between stress and emotional exhaustion, that is, burnout,
23 resulting from high demands and low social support (Esteves, Leão and Alves, 2019). In this sense, and
24 following the JD-R theory, interventions at the level of burnout can be beneficial, that is, if levels of
25 demand are addressed (such as by being given a reasonable workload) and adequate resources are made
26 available (that is, the possibility of being able to influence one's work, to benefit from recognition and
27 effective leadership) (Hakanen and Bakker, 2016).
28
29
30

31
32 The results of the previously mentioned studies are useful for understanding the impact of these variables
33 on workers' health and well-being. Nonetheless, the real conditions to which workers are subject in the
34 workplace still seem to be unclear. The means in which this issue has been dealt with contributes to the
35 problem itself, even in the political and legislative domain, but mainly with regard to the prevention
36 practices that have been implemented in diverse work contexts, and which seem to have, predominantly,
37 been guided by individualization, prescription and accountability, rather than by systemic and ecological
38 perspectives (Torres, Gaspar and Lobo, 2016). On the other hand, it is important to understand how
39 these effects are felt in older populations, given the need to prolong active life and ensure active aging.
40
41
42
43

44
45 In fact, psychosocial occupational risks related to job characteristics and interpersonal relationships at
46 work influence health from a bio-psycho-social perspective. The reduction or effective management of
47 psychosocial risks at work should be a priority for the well-being of professionals and organizational
48 well-being. Specifically, the risks related to stress and burnout have a special impact on the health and
49 performance of the worker and, in more serious situations, can even jeopardize their competence, ability,
50 and enjoyment of the work itself. These aspects gain even more relevance when we approach older
51 workers in the retirement process. This is a life event that can be a risk to the overall health of
52 individuals. Many professionals when they retire lose social support, routines, time occupation,
53 perceived competence, participation and even meaning in life. This study is an important contribution
54 to better understand relationship between psychosocial risk factors at work, health and meaning of life
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of professionals in the process of retirement. The results allow us to understand relationships and their
4 strengths. On the one hand, we understand that psychosocial risks at work have a negative impact on
5 the health and meaning of life of older professionals, that these risks have a negative impact on the later
6 working life but can also negatively influence the retirement stage. Psychosocial risks at work can have
7 a cumulative and long-term effect that will influence the way the individual will adapt to retirement, the
8 social and emotional competencies with which they will face this stage: if they are weakened can
9 influence their physical and psychological health and the meaning of life.
10

11
12 Considering the main goals of the United Nations 2030 Agenda for sustainable development, this study
13 contributes, namely, to the 3rd one “Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages” and
14 the 8th one “Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive
15 employment and decent work for all” (United Nations, 2015, pp14). Deepening knowledge related to
16 the condition in which older people work and at their health, contributes not only to more productive
17 organizations, to less spending of public money on health, but also to a more inclusive society. Bearing
18 in mind workers are progressively retiring later and that the exposure to certain work conditions during
19 the late career is problematic for organisations and for society in general, this study has practical and
20 social implication.
21

22
23 In view of the above, the implementation of a systemic and ecological approach (Amalberti, 1996, 2003,
24 cited in De la Garza & Poy, 2009) with regard to occupational health and prevention practices becomes
25 a priority. This implies the definition of a prevention plan that considers the participation of different
26 agents, of different organizational levels and with different ages and professional experiences. Health
27 prevention should take place within in a multilevel perspective, crossing cognitive and
28 psychophysiological characteristics of workers, workplace and technical resources, the collective of
29 workers and also the organization itself.
30

31
32 A specific and systematic intervention in the preparation of the retirement process through the reduction
33 or promotion of effective management of psychosocial risks in the work of older workers, preparation
34 and promotion of socio-emotional skills and retirement planning through the readaptation of the
35 meaning of life, promoting more participation and empowered older people with a more active role in
36 their lives and in society.
37

38
39 Some authors have maintained that age can create a buffer against the negative effects of workload,
40 through increased maturity and emotional regulation (Mauno, Ruokolainen and Kinnunen, 2013, *cited*
41 *in* Mäkikangas, Kinnunen, Feldt and Shaufeli, 2016, p 49). It may also be that, on the one hand, working
42 retirees will tend, at the outset to be in reasonable health given that they are engaged in some form of
43 occupation. Conversely, retired respondents could have had difficulty reporting on their last work
44 situations. Considering that the COPSOQ is an instrument conceived for active people, this may be a
45 limitation to the study. Future research may be addressed by qualitative or mixed methodologies, which
46 might provide a more comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon. Due to fluctuations in feelings
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of exhaustion, cynicism and professional inefficacy, Hakanen and Bakker (2016) suggested that
4 qualitative methodologies could potentially look into burnout, for example, through diary studies.
5 Conversely, as Kooj, Lange, Jansen and Dijkers (2013) argued, occupational well-being studies should
6 take into account not only the chronological age of participants, but also the perception that older
7 workers have of their own health statuses. In this sense, understanding the meaning that humans attribute
8 to work, dynamically, throughout their lives, and the way they manage and develop their health, through
9 the (re)definition of norms and values (Canguilhem, 2002; Schwartz, 2000), might lead us to conduct
10 future research using an Activity-oriented Approach to Ergonomics (Daniellou, 2005; Daniellou and
11 Rabardel, 2005; Guérin *et al.*, 2001).

12
13
14
15
16
17
18 Another possible limitation of this research may be associated with the results that could translate
19 specificities of the Portuguese reality. Also the sample shows some gender imbalance, with 62% being
20 female and 38% male.

21
22
23 The sample size is a strength, the fact that the sample is national including participants from different
24 parts of the country may be a strength but may also have conditioned the results, once SEM's have been
25 used. The challenges facing human resource management today, and the various actors involved in
26 occupational health issues, place particular emphasis on the psychologist in the workplace. Nevertheless,
27 designing and maintaining healthy, sustainable workplaces will involve dialogue and a strong
28 commitment on the part of the various organizational stakeholders, along with national and international
29 policies. This will involve studying age as well as its related critical factors, not only at the individual
30 level, but also at the governmental, societal and organizational levels of our modern aging world, and
31 developing measures to address its consequences. This idea has been propounded by the World Bank
32 (2012, *cited in* Ismail, Fauzi, Shamsuddin, Hadi, Azid and Razali, 2013, p. 933), which stressed that the
33 relationships between psychosocial factors and health risks are important not only at individual level,
34 but also at organizational level, as they affect organizational productivity and, concomitantly, nations
35 themselves. Recognizing that, in the organizational context, the meaning in life is not yet a fully explored
36 construct (Ward and King, 2017), the present study seeks to make a contribution towards a better
37 understanding of its relationship with health and well-being, which will have repercussions for levels of
38 job satisfaction and performance, not only for the individual, but also for organizations. We believe that
39 the present study is innovative by studying the effect that health itself has on meaning in life, as few
40 research has examined this effect. We also suggest that longitudinal research should be developed in
41 this field of knowledge, given that the effects of exposure to certain working conditions are only felt
42 long-term, and that the need to work until later in life is indubitable, specifically, since we need to work
43 longer, we should explore means of doing so while maintaining good health. This will involve the
44 adoption of a different theoretical viewpoint based on the long-term development of employee well-
45 being, using, for example, the conservation of resources model, which argues that "... people are
46 motivated to gain, maintain, and accumulate resources – which can be anything that is either valuable
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in its own right or importance for protecting other resources or attaining future goals... It also assumes
4 that the relationship between different resources is mutual and dynamic in nature” (Hobfoll, 1989, 2002,
5 cited in Mäkikangas, Kinnunen, Feldt and Shaufeli, 2016, p. 49). In fact, considering the results obtained
6 in this study, we believe that future research would benefit from a longitudinal approach, accompanying
7 workers throughout the last stage of their career and after entering retirement. This approach would
8 benefit even deeper insights into how the effect that job demands affect health and how those demands
9 can explain health inequalities. In addition, future analysis could also use the sociodemographic factors
10 as control variables

11
12
13
14
15
16 The meaning of life is one of the most important factors contributing to healthy and active aging. The
17 quality of working life and the psychosocial risks of work in the later years of active working life will
18 condition the retirement and aging process. Health from a bio-psycho-social perspective influences and
19 is influenced by the work situation, namely physical health, mental health, work stress, and acceptance
20 and integration in the workplace.

21
22
23
24
25 Work contributes to mental health and chronic health problems, policies to promote working longer and
26 to reduce the incidence of early exit from the workforce need to focus on prevention and helping those
27 with chronic conditions to actively function at work.

28
29
30 In conclusion, the results of the study confirm the relationship between psychosocial risks at work and
31 stress and burnout as well as the relationship between health and the meaning of life in older workers.
32 This leads us to reflect on the relevance of identifying, minimizing, and managing psychosocial risks at
33 work in order to reduce work stress and burnout and promote a sense of meaning in life. In relation to
34 older workers, this relationship is even more relevant since retirement is a potentially risky life event
35 for people's health and meaning of life. We believe that the promotion of socioemotional competencies,
36 the implementation of an integration strategy, and a progressive retirement process are important aspects
37 to reduce the psychosocial risks in the last years of work, reduce stress and burnout, and promote a more
38 positive and active retirement process with less risk to bio-psycho-social health.

46 47 **Conflict of Interest**

48
49 The authors of this article declare no conflict of interest.

52 53 **References**

54
55 Albertsen, K., Rugulies, R., Garde, A.H., and Burr, H. (2010), “The Effect of the environment and
56 performance-based self-esteem on cognitive stress symptoms among Danish knowledge workers”,
57 *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 38 (Suppl 3), 81-89.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Allan, B.A., Dexter, C., Kinsey, R. and Parker, S. (2016), “Meaningful work and mental health: job
4 satisfaction as a moderator”, *Journal of Mental Health*, 27 (1), 38-44.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638237.2016.1244718>.
7
8 Arndt, R. (1987), “Work pace, stress, and cumulative trauma disorders”, *The Journal of Hand Surgery*,
9 12 (5), 866-9.
10
11
12 Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). “On the evaluation of structural equation models.” *Journal of the*
13 *Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), 74-94.
14
15
16 Bakker, A. B. and Demerouti, E. (2016, October 10), “Job Demands–Resources Theory: Taking Stock
17 and Looking Forward”, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. Advance online publication.
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>.
19
20
21 Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. and Euwema, M.C. (2005), “Job Resources Buffer the Impact of Job
22 Demands on Burnout”, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10 (2), 170-180.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.170>.
24
25
26 Baldonado, M., Mosteiro, P., Queirós, C., Borges, E. and Abreu, M. (2018), “Stress no trabalho em
27 enfermeiros: estudo comparativo Espanha/Portugal”, *International Journal on Working*
28 *Conditions*, 15, 67-80.
29
30
31 Ben-Itzhak, S., Dvash, J., Maor, M., Rosenberg, N., & Halpern, P. (2015), “Sense of meaning as a
32 predictor of burnout in emergency physicians in Israel: a national survey”, *Clinical and*
33 *Experimental Emergency Medicine*, 2(4), 217–225. <https://doi.org/10.15441/ceem.15.074>.
34
35
36 Bjorner, J., Albertsen, K. and Rugulies, R. (2010), “Introduction to the supplement on the Copenhagen
37 Psychosocial Questionnaire – in honour of Tage Søndergaard Kristensen”, *Scandinavian Journal*
38 *of Public Health*, 2010; 38(Suppl 3): 4–7.
39
40
41 Brühlmann, T. (2013), “Burnout”, *Schmerz*, 27:521–533. DOI 10.1007/s00482-013-1312-3
42
43 Canguilhem, G. (2002), *Écrit sur la médecine*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris.
44
45
46 Casper, A., Sonnetag, S. and Tremmel, S. (2017), “Mindset matters: the role of employees’ stress
47 mindset for day-specific reactions to workload anticipation”, *European Journal of Work and*
48 *Organizational Psychology*, 26 (6), 798-810. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1374947>.
49
50
51 Cassou, B. & Laville, A. (1996), “Vieillesse et travail: cadre general de l’enquête ESTEV”. In A.
52 Derriennic, A. Touranchet and S. Volkoff. *Age, Travail Santé*. Paris: Les Éditions INSERM.
53
54
55 Cheng, Y., Chen, I-S., Chen, C-J., Burr, H. & Hasselhorn, H-M (2013), “The influence of age on the
56 distribution of self-rated health, burnout and their associations with psychosocial work conditions”,
57 *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 74, 213-220.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Clot, Y. (2013), “O ofício como operador de saúde”, *Cadernos de Psicologia Social do Trabalho*, 161,
4 p. 1-11.
5
6
7 Cru, D. and Dejours, C. (1983), “Les savoir-faire de prudence dans les métiers du bâtiment”, *Les cahiers*
8 *medico-sociaux 27ème année (3)*, 239-247.
9
10 Cru, D. (2000), “Prévention et formes du dialogue social – Mise en perspective socio-historique”, *Revue*
11 *de Médecine du Travail*, XXVII, 2, 119-126.
12
13 Crumbaugh, J. (1968). “Cross-validation of a purpose-in-life test based on Frankl’s concepts”, *Journal*
14 *of Individual Psychology*, 24, 74-81.
15
16 Crumbaugh, J. and Maholick, L. (1964), “An experimental study in existentialism: The psychometric
17 approach to Frankl’s concept of Noogénic neurosis”, *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 20, 200-207.
18
19 Daniellou, F. (2010), “El ergónomo frente a la crisis global”, *Laboreal*, 6, (1), 31–36.
20 <http://laboreal.up.pt/revista/artigo.php?id=37t45nSU54711238:76256539:1>.
21
22 Daniellou, F. (2005), “The French-speaking ergonomists' approach to work activity: cross-influences of
23 field intervention and conceptual models”, *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, 6:5, 409-427,
24 DOI: 10.1080/14639220500078252.
25
26 Daniellou, F. and Rabardel, P. (2005), “Activity-oriented approaches to ergonomics: some traditions
27 and communities”, *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* ,6:5, 353-357,
28 DOI:10.1080/14639220500078351.
29
30 Davezies, Ph. (2001), “Convergences, tensions et contradictions entre les différentes approches de la
31 santé au travail”, *Performances. Stratégie et Facteur Humain*, 5, 14- 21.
32
33 Davezies, Ph. (1998), “De la récupération psychique”, *Santé et Travail*, 25, 35-37.
34
35 De la Garza, C. and Poy, M. (2009), “Seguridad y salud laboral, seguridad industrial: desafíos de un
36 enfoque de prevención sustentable”, *Laboreal*, 5, (1), 95-105.
37 <http://laboreal.up.pt/revista/artigo.php?id=37t45nSU5471123592235663451>.
38
39 Esteves, G.G.L., Leão, A.A.M. and Alves, E.O. (2019), “Fadiga e Estresse como preditores do Burnout
40 em Profissionais da Saúde”, *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho*, 19 (3), 695-702.
41 <https://doi.org/10.17652/rpot/2019.3.16943>.
42
43 Eurofound (2019), “Working Conditions and workers’ health”, *Publications Office of the European*
44 *Union*, Luxembourg. <https://doi:10.2806/909840 TJ-04-19-360-EN-N>.
45
46 Eurofound (2014), “Employment opportunities for people with chronic diseases: Executive summary”,
47 Dublin, Ireland: *Eurofound*. Retrieved 27 April 2016 from:
48 [http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef1459en1](http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef1459en1.pdf).
49 pdf.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Evenstad, S. (2018), “The virtuous circle of ephemeralization and the vicious circle of stress: A systemic
4 perspective on ICT worker burnout”, *Futures*, 103, 61-72.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2018.03.013>
6
7
8 Ferreira, A.B. (2015), “Saúde no Trabalho: Uma Avaliação de Riscos Psicossociais numa empresa do
9 ramo industrial”, *Dissertação apresentada para a obtenção do grau de Mestre*, Faculdade de
10 Ciências Humanas e Sociais Universidade Fernando Pessoa, Porto, Portugal.
11
12 Fleischmann, M., Xue, B., and Head, J. (2020), “Mental Health Before and After Retirement—
13 Assessing the Relevance of Psychosocial Working Conditions: The Whitehall II Prospective Study
14 of British Civil Servants”, *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, Volume 75, Issue 2, February
15 2020, Pages 403–413, <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbz042>
16
17
18 Frankl, V. (2004), “*Man’s search for meaning*”, Ebury Publishing: London.
19
20
21 Fornell, C. and Larcker, D. F. (1981), “Structural equation models with unobservable variables and
22 measurement error: algebra and statistics”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(3), 382-88.
23 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3150980>.
24
25
26 García, M.M., Inglesias, S., Saleta, M. and Romay, J. (2016), “Riesgos psicosociales en el profesorado
27 de enseñanza universitaria: diagnóstico y prevención”, *Journal of Work and Organizational*
28 *Psychology*, 32, 173-182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2016.07.001>.
29
30
31 García-Guiu, C., Molero, F. and Moriano, J.A. (2015), “Authentic leadership and its influence on group
32 cohesion and organizational identification: the role of organizational justice as a mediating
33 variable”, *International Journal of Social Psychology*, 30 (1), 60-88.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02134748.2014.987539>. Gollac, M. & Volkoff, S. (2000), “Les conditions
35 de travail”, Paris: Editions La Découverte.
36
37
38 Gonçalves, A.M., Vilela, S.C., Terra, F.S. and Nogueira, D.A. (2016), “Atitudes e o prazer/sofrimento
39 no trabalho em saúde mental”, *Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem*, 69 (2), 266-274.
40 <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7167.2016690209i>.
41
42
43 Gregersen, S., Vicente-Hoper, S. and Nienhaus, A. (2016), “Job-related resources, leader-member
44 Exchange and well-being – a longitudinal study”, *Work and Stress*, 30 (4), 356-373.
45
46
47 Guérin, A., Laville, F., Daniellou, J., Duraffourg, J. and Kerguelen, A. (2001), “*Comprendre le Travail*
48 *pour le Transformer. La pratique de l’Ergonomie*”, Anact, Lyon.
49
50
51 Hair, J. F., Black, W.C., Babin, B., Anderson, R.E. and Tatham, R.L. (2006), *Multivariate Data*
52 *Analysis*, 6thEd., Pearson, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hakanen, J.J. and Bakker, A.B. (2016), “Born and Bred to Burn out: A Life-Course View and
4 Reflections on Job Burnout”, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22 (3), 354-364.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000053>.
6
7
8 Harlow, L. L., Newcomb, M. D. and Bentler, P. M. (1987), “Purpose in Life Test assessment using
9 latent variable methods”, *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 26(3), 235–236.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1987.tb01355.x>
11
12
13 Havermans, B.M., Boot, C.R.L., and Hoekstra, T. (2018), “The association between exposure to
14 psychosocial work factors and mental health in older employees, a 3-year follow-up study”,
15 *International Archives Occupational Environment Health*, 91, 57–66.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-017-1261-8>
17
18
19
20 Hiesinger, K., and Tophoven, S. (2019), “Job requirement level, work demands, and health: a
21 prospective study among older workers” *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*, 92, 1139–1149.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-019-01451-2>
23
24
25
26 Hirschle, A.L.T., Godim, S.M.G., Alberton, G.D. and Ferreira, A.S.M. (2019), “Estresse e bem-estar no
27 trabalho: o papel moderador da regulação emocional”, *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e*
28 *Trabalho*, 19 (1), 532-540. <https://doi.org/10.17652/rpot/2019.1.14774>.
29
30
31 Holst GJ, Paarup HM, Baelum J. (2012), “A cross-sectional study of psychosocial work environment
32 and stress in the Danish symphony orchestras”, *International Archives of Occupational*
33 *Environmental Health*, 85(6):639-49. doi: 10.1007/s00420-011-0710-z.
34
35
36 Ismail, A., Fauzi, N.Z., Shamsuddin, N.R., Hadi, A.A., Azid, N.N. and Razali, N.M. (2013), “The
37 Analysis of Job Related Stress and Health Related Quality of Life (HRQoL) of Lectures: using
38 SPSS 16 and Structural Equation Modeling”, *IEEE Business Engineering and Industrial*
39 *Applications Colloquium*, 932-937.
40
41
42
43 Jensen, S.M. and Luthans, F. (2006), “Entrepreneurs as Authentic Leaders: Impact on Employee’
44 Attitudes”, *Leadership and Organization Development*, 27 (8).
45 <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730610709273>.
46
47
48 Karasek, R. (1979), “Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job
49 redesign”, *Administrative Science*, 24, 285–308.
50
51
52 Karasek, R. and Theorell, T. (1990), *Healthy work: stress, productivity and the reconstruction of*
53 *working life*, Basic Books: New York.
54
55
56 Kiersch, C.E. (2012), “A multi-level examination of authentic leadership and organizational justice in
57 uncertain times”, *Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy*. Fort Collins, Colorado State
58 University.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kleinbaum, D. G., Kupper, L.L. and Muller, K. E. (1988), "Variable reduction and factor analysis",
4 *Applied Regression Analysis and Other Multivariable Methods*, 2nd Ed. Pacif Grove, Calif, 595-
5 642.
6
7
8 Kline, R. B. (2011), *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*, The Guildford Press,
9 New York.
10
11
12 Kokoroko, E. and Sanda, M.A. (2019), "Effect of Workload on Job Stress of Ghanaian OPD Nurses:
13 The role of Coworker Support", *Safety and Health at Work*, 10, 341-346.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shaw.2019.04.002>.
15
16
17 Kooj, D.T.A.M., Lange, A.H., Jansen, P.G.W. and Dijkers, J.S.E. (2013), "Beyond chronological age.
18 Examining perceived future time and subjective health as age-related mediators in relations to
19 work-related motivations and well-being", *Work and Stress*, 27 (1), 88-105.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2013.769328>.
21
22
23
24 Kristensen, T.S., Hannerz, H., Hogh, H. and Borg, V. (2005), "The Copenhagen Psychosocial
25 Questionnaire – A toll for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment",
26 *Scandinavian Journal of Environmental Health*, 31 (6), 438-49.
27
28
29 Lasfargues, G. (2005), "Départs en retraite et "travaux pénibles». L'usage des connaissances
30 scientifiques sur le travail et ses risques à long terme pour la santé. Rapport de recherche", *Centre*
31 *d'Études de l'Emploi, Noisy-le-Grand* .
32
33
34 Lazarus, R.S. and Folkman, S. (1984), *Stress, appraisal and coping*, Springer Publishing, New York.
35
36
37 Macky, K., and Boxall, P. (2008), "High-Involvement Work Processes, Work Intensification and
38 Employee Well-Being: A Study of New Zealand Worker Experiences", *Asia Pacific Journal of*
39 *Human Resources*, 46 (1):38–55.[doi:10.1177/1038411107086542](https://doi.org/10.1177/1038411107086542).
40
41
42 Mäkikangas, A., Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T. and Shaufeli, W. (2016), "The longitudinal development of
43 employee well-being: a systematic review", *Work and Stress*, 30 (1), 46-70.
44 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2015.1126870>.
45
46
47 Marôco, J., Marôco, A.L., Leite, E., Bastos, C., Vazão, M.J. and Campos, J. (2016), "Burnout em
48 Profissionais da Saúde Portugueses: Uma Análise a Nível Nacional", *Acta Med Port*, 29 (1), 24-
49 30.
50
51
52 Maslach, C. and Leiter, M.P. (2008), "Early predictors of job burnout and engagement", *Journal of*
53 *Applied Psychology*, 93, 498-512.
54
55
56 Maslach, C. and Jackson, S.E. (1981), "The measurement of experienced burnout", *Journal of*
57 *Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Park, J. and Baumeister, R.F. (2017), “Meaning in life and adjustment to daily stressors”, *The Journal*
4 *of Positive Psychology*, 12 (4), 333-341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1209542>.
- 6 Pejtersen, J.H., Kristensen, T.S., Borg, V. and Bjorner, J.B. (2010), “The second version of the
7 Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ II)”, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*,
8 38 (Suppl 3), 8–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494809349858>.
- 11 Peralta, E. (2001), “Estudo sobre os objectivos de vida na idade adulta avançada”, *Dissertação de*
12 *Mestrado apresentada pela Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação da Universidade*
13 *de Lisboa*.
- 16 Peralta, E. and Silva, M. (2003), “Teste dos Objectivos de Vida (PIL-R)”, Gonçalves, M., Simões, M.,
17 Almeida, L. E Machado, C. (Coords.), *Avaliação Psicológica: instrumentos validados para a*
18 *população portuguesa*, Vol.I, Coimbra. Quarteto.
- 22 Pisanti, R., Montgomery, A.J. and Quick, J.C. (2017), “Editorial: Psychosocial Job Dimensions and
23 Distress/Well-being: Issues and Challenges in Occupational Health Psychology”, *Frontiers in*
24 *Psychology*, 8, 2213. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02213>.
- 27 Román-Calderón, J.P., Krikorian, A., Ruiz, F., and Gaviria, A.B. (2016), “Apoyo organizacional Y
28 empoderamiento como antecedents de comportamentos empoderados y participación de los
29 empleados”, *Estudios Genenciales*, 32 (139), 154-161.
- 33 Russo-Netzer, P., Sinai, M. and Zeevi, M. (2019), “Meaning in life and work among counsellors: a
34 qualitative exploration”, *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*,
35 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2019.1625026>.
- 38 Sadir, M.A. and Lipp, M.E.N. (2009), “As fontes de stress no trabalho”, *Revista Psicologia da IMED*,
39 1(1), 114-126. <https://doi.org/10.18256/2175-5027/psico-imed.v1n1p114-126>.
- 42 Schaufeli, W. B. and Bakker, A. (2004), “Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with
43 burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25 (3), 293
44 – 315.
- 47 Sherman, N. E., Michel, R., Rybak, C., Randall, G. K. and Davidson, J. (2011), “Meaning in life and
48 volunteerism in older adults”, *Adultspan Journal*, 10(2), 78-90.
- 51 Shiah, Y. J., Chang, F., Chiang, S. K., Lin, I. M. and Tam, W. C. C. (2015), “Religion and health:
52 anxiety, religiosity, meaning of life and mental health”, *Journal of Religion and Health*, 54(1), 35-
53 45.
- 56 Silva, C., Amaral, V., Pereira, A., Bem-haja, P., Pereira, A., Rodrigues, V., Cotrim, V., Silvério,
57 T. and Nossa, P. (2011). *Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire. Portugal e Países Africanos de*
58 *Língua Oficial Portuguesa*. Aveiro: Departamento de Educação, Universidade de Aveiro.
- 59
60

- 1
2
3 Siqueira, M.M.M. and Pavadom, V.A.R. (2008), “Bases teóricas de bem-estar subjetivo, bem-estar
4 psicológico e bem-estar no trabalho”, *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 24 (2), 201-209.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1590/SO102-37722008000200010>.
6
7
8 Sousa, C.V., Cabral, J.M.S. and Batista, N.K. (2019), “A síndrome de Burnout e o trabalho de técnicos
9 de enfermagem num hospital privado”, *Revista Alcance*, 26 (1), 61-76.
10
11
12 Souza, M.B.C.A., Helal, D.H. and Paiva, K.C.M. (2017), “Burnout e jovens trabalhadores”, *Caderno*
13 *Brasileiro de Terapia Ocupacional*, 25 (4), 751-763.
14
15
16 Schwartz, Y. (2000), *Le paradigme ergologique ou un métier de philosophe*, Octarès Éditions, Toulouse.
17
18 Taris, T.W. and Schaufeli, W.B. (2016), “The Job Demands-Resources Model”, S. Clark, T.M. Probst,
19 F. Guldenmund and J. Passmore, *Handbook of the Psychology of Occupational Safety and*
20 *Workplace Health*, Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
21
22
23 Thébaud-Mony, A., Davezies, Ph., Voguel, L. and Volkoff, S. (2015), *Les Risques du Travail*, La
24 Découverte, Paris.
25
26
27 Thorsen, V., Jensen, P., and Bjorner, J. (2016), “Psychosocial work environment and retirement age: a
28 prospective study of 1876 senior employees”, *International archives of occupational and*
29 *environmental health*. 89. 10.1007/s00420-016-1125-7.
30
31
32 Tophoven, S., Tisch, A., Rauch, A. and Burghardt, A. (2015), “Psychosocial working conditions and
33 mental health status of the German babyboomer generation”, *Gesundheitswesen (Bundesverband*
34 *der Ärzte des Öffentlichen Gesundheitsdienstes (Germany) Gesundheitswesen*, 77 (4), pp. 63-9.
35
36
37 Torres, I. (2006), “Mudanças organizacionais, saúde e bem-estar na banca portuguesa. Idade e sentidos
38 do trabalho numa nova relação salarial (resumo tese)”, *Laboreal*, II, 2.
39
40
41 Torres, I., Gaspar, T. and Lobo, F. (2016), “Sustainable Work and Health - A Study on Active Aging”,
42 *International Symposium on Occupational Safety and Hygiene. Proceedings*.
43
44
45 United Nations (2015), “Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
46 Goals” (SDGs).
47
48
49 Vaz Serra, A. (2000), “Vulnerabilidade ao stress”, *Psiquiatria Clínica*, 21 (4), 261-278.
50
51
52 Vohs, K.D. Aaker, J.L. and Catapano, R. (2019), “It’s not going to be fun: negative experiences can add
53 meaning to life”, *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 26, 11-14.
54 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.04.014>.
55
56
57 Volkoff, S. (2005), “La mesure des possible”. In S. Volkoff (Coord.) *L’ergonomie et les chiffres de la*
58 *santé au travail: ressources, tensions et pièges* (43-68). Toulouse: Octarès Éditions.
59
60
61 Volkoff, S. (1997), “La dictature du temps”, *Entretien avec Serge Volkoff*. Page 2.

1
2
3 Ward, S.J. and King, L.A. (2017), “Work and the good life: How work contributes to meaning in life”,
4 *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 37, 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2017.10.001>.

6 WHO (2002), “Active ageing. A policy framework”. Geneva: World Health Organization (WHO).

8
9 Yamada, K., Matsudaira, K., Irmano, H., Kitamura, A. and Iso, H. (2016), “Influence of work-related
10 psychosocial factors on the prevalence of chronic pain and quality of life in patients with chronic”,
11 *BMJ Open*, 6: e010356. <https://doi.org/1136/bmjopen-2015-010356>.

13
14 Yang, T. Shen, Y.M., Shu, M., Liu, Y., Deng, J., Chen, Q. and See, L.C. (2015), “Effects of Co-Worker
15 and Supervisor Support on Job Stress and Presenteeism in an Aging Workforce: A Structural
16 Equation Modelling Approach”, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
17 Health*, 13, 72. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13010072>.

19
20 Zábrodská, K., Mudrák, J., Květoň, P., Blatný, M., Machovcová, K. and Šolcová, I. (2014), “Work
21 Environment and Well-being of Academic Faculty in Czech Universities: a Pilot Study”, *Studia
22 Paedagogica*, 19 (4), 121-144. <https://doi.org/10.5817/SP2014-4-6>.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60